

Judicial Administration Committee
Judicial Conference of Indiana

Minutes
November 9, 2001

The Judicial Administration Committee of the Judicial Conference of Indiana met at the Indiana Judicial Center on Friday, November 9, 2001 from 10:00 a.m. – 3:00 p.m.

1. Members present. Scott R. Bowers, Steven M. Fleece, George J. Heid, Karen M. Love, Judith S. Proffitt, Michael A. Shurn, P. Thomas Snow, David L. Welch and Frances C. Gull, Chair.
2. Staff present. Jeffrey Bercovitz provided the committee with staff assistance.
3. Guests present. Doug Cresler, Supreme Court Administrator's Office; Ron Miller and Andy Straw, State Court Administrator's Office; and Mr. Andy Hutcherson and Dr. Brian Vargus, I. U. Public Opinion Laboratory were also present.
4. Minutes approved. The minutes for the meeting of the committee on July 13, 2001 were approved.
5. Weighted caseload update.
 - a. Mr. Doug Cressler, Supreme Court Administrator discussed three categories of death penalty cases: Those filed by the prosecutor which never go to trial, those cases that do go to trial, and those which return to the trial court on a PCR. He selected 7 cases covering these categories for the committee to review for the purpose of the weighted caseload update. The committee members asked for 3 additional cases that did not go to trial.
 - b. Mr. Hutcherson reported problems with the study and the I.U. Public Opinion Lab could not complete it in its present form. He said counties were stalling in getting data to him, which he suspected was because of cost from the Clerk's computer vendor, the cost of two weeks worth of overnights to get data from Lake and Porter counties, the need to get 500 juvenile cases in Marion County when it took all day to get 91 cases, and the lack of personnel at their office to get this project completed. He suggested that Tippecanoe data (already collected) be used along with Marion County data that he could collect, be compared against data collected in the first study to note any differences. He also suggested the same method to collect judicial action data be used as last time to it. Dr. Vargus said the difficulty in obtaining data underlines the lack of resources to run the judicial system.
 - c. Judge Welch stated the resources needed to be found to do the study to answer the criticism of the last study – the perception that clerks might have been biased in favor their judges and counted judicial actions incorrectly. Resources must be found to have an independent party count the number of judicial actions in a case. Judge Bowers said statewide funding and a statewide computer system might solve this problem in the future. Mr. Miller said he could contact vendors of computer systems in Indiana to get a list of all the various cases filed in 1995, 1996, 1999 and 2000 in the counties needed for the update study and give it to Mr. Hutcherson. Mr. Hutcherson replied he might be able to do the study if, after getting the list of cases to him,

Mr. Miller could get the CCS's to him of cases he randomly selected. Mr. Hutcherson could count the number of judge actions in his office. This would answer the criticism of the first study. Mr. Hutcherson agreed to meet with Mr. Miller and determine if the study could continue under these circumstances with monies available. Mr. Miller agreed to update the committee by December 7 on the progress of his work with Mr. Hutcherson and the computer vendors of the various clerk's offices in the counties of the study.

d. The committee members made the following suggestions to the JTAC committee concerning case management system:

- (1) Should access CCS's over the Internet with necessary protections for confidentiality.
- (2) Should be able to email CCS entries.
- (3) Should have capacity for document filing by email and distribution of filed documents.
- (4) Should have capacity for electronic document storage.
- (5) Each document should be hot-linked to its CCS entry.
- (6) Each court should have a digital recording system; each recording should be hot linked to a CCS entry; and a court should be able to email copy of recordings to a party of a particular proceeding.
- (7) Data entry codes should be keyed to the 11 judicial actions under the weighted caseload study.
- (8) Case aging reports should be available by case, with case name, attorneys, next court date, bond status, confinement status (if criminal) and other data determined by the local judge.
- (9) Should send automatic 41E notice to attorneys that no action has been taken on a case for x number of days.
- (10) Should interface the court computer with clerk computer for financial information, e.g. probation user fees, restitution, court costs in criminal case, or collections on judgments, monies in trust in civil cases.
- (11) Should have a statewide name search capacity for criminal history.
- (12) Should have probation management functions.
- (13) Should have standardized forms.

The committee agreed to transmit additional suggestions on an individual basis to Ron Miller for JTAC consideration by calling (317) 232-2542 or Email at rmiller@courts.state.in.us.

6. Next meeting. The committee agreed to meet again on Friday, January 11, February 8, March 8, April 12, May 10, June 14, July 12, August 9, 2002, from 10:00 a.m. until 4:00 p.m. at the Indiana Judicial Center. They also agreed to meet on Wednesday, September 11 in conjunction with the judicial conference, on Friday, October 11, and Friday, November 8, 2002 from 10:00 a.m. – 4:00 p.m. at the Indiana Judicial Center.

Respectfully submitted,

Jeffrey Bercovitz, Director
Juvenile and Family Law